

In our opinion those priority sectors would be:

- internationally traded products such as automobiles and appliances
- internationally oriented energy intensive industrial processes such as steel, aluminum and chemicals manufacturing
- HFC and PFC use (see also our proposals for guidelines on fluorocarbons in FCCC/CP/1995/Misc.1 @ 45)
- airline and marine shipping industries

If the AGBM needs that kind of sector specific information - and I am convinced it will if it wants to address the issue of coordinated policies and measures adequately - then SBSTA should take the AGBM requirements into account. In other words, the work of the panels should be narrowly focused on those sectors that AGBM identifies as priority areas and they should bring together the real experts in those sectors. AGBM will have to ask SBSTA to act accordingly.

We can fully support the remarks made by the representative of Brazil on the contribution IPCC could make via SBSTA to the work of AGBM based on requests from Convention bodies to the IPCC. Also the suggestion on requesting a methodology to determine contribution of countries to the problem of climate change is a very interesting one.

With respect to the US suggestion, to set up a special panel on inputs regarding the global emission trends, I would like to point to the decision 6 of CoP-1 that clearly specifies that as a task for SBSTA.

Inputs based on available information

A lot of relevant information on possible policies and measures for Annex-1 countries and their technical and economic aspects is available from analyses that were already done or are currently in progress outside of the Convention machinery. The ongoing OECD/IEA Common Actions study is particularly relevant, because it provides a useful classification of policies and measures in 3 categories:

1. policies and measures that are decided at the national level,
2. policies and measures that will benefit from a certain coordination between (groups of) countries,
3. policies and measures that will only be undertaken if agreed internationally.

As a protocol will have to focus predominantly on categories 2 and 3 it does not make sense to provide the AGBM with a lot of information on policies and measures that are primarily decided at the national level apart from the information available from the review of the national communications, especially potentially replicable measures. The AGBM should focus on provisions, to be included in the protocol, to enable the exchange of experience with national policies and measures between Parties.

Priority issues to be dealt with in our opinion are the use of economic instruments as well as the issues mentioned above in connection with the technical panels.